



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/088,144	06/11/2002	Wolfgang Reeb	1997	1019
7590 11/30/2004				
Striker Striker & Stenby 103 East Neck Road Huntington, NY 11743		EXAMINER EASTHOM, KARL D		
		ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER		
		2832		

DATE MAILED: 11/30/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/088,144

Applicant(s)

REEB ET AL.

Examiner

Karl D Easthom

Art Unit

2832

*Handwritten signature*

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 October 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 13-22 and 24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 13-15, 17-22 and 24 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 16 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- 1) ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - 2) ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - 3) ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

## Attachment(s)

- |                                                                                                                                                |                                                                                         |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                                                                               | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                                           | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>2/21/2002</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                                                |

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 13-15, 17-19, 21-22, and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being obvious over Petrone et al. (EP '359 by app.) in view of Masahiro (JP '544 by app.). Petrone discloses, except explicit mention of the position sensor 7 as a potentiometer, the claimed invention at Figs. 1 with housing 2 or 2 with 8, potentiometer housing 4, or 4 with 8, potentiometer 7, motor 5, detent projection the projections defining the channel of housing 2 that mate with the tooth in potentiometer housing 4. Or note that the housing 2 has detent projection 41 that mates with the tooth 8 of the potentiometer housing 7. In claim 14, it is on the circumference. In claim 15, 4 is on 2. For claim 17, the housing 7 of the potentiometer, considered as the housing, or part of the housing 4, has a hole in the vicinity of the housing 4 where vicinity is broad. Or the part 6 is part of the housing with a hole as seen. In claim 18, the electrical connections are at 6, with implied or obvious wire attachments that typically are not entirely straight, so that same are obviously similar to a serpentine, so that it would have been obvious to employ same. In claim 19, see the wheel 36, transverses worm 24 and shaft 16. For claim 21, all parts are installable as claimed, from the top, for example. In claim 22, the

elements have been so inserted. For claim 24, the elements are one-piece. Because potentiometers are typically known as and function as position sensors, where Masahiro at the abstract discloses such a potentiometer for position sensing with worm gears and motors similar to that of Petrone, it would have been obvious to employ one to aid in control or sensing..

4. Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hayden or Petrone et al., in view of Brown. Hayden discloses the claimed invention except the leaf spring. Brown discloses a helical spring 14 for damping axial motion of the motor rotor shaft, and it would have been obvious to employ any equivalent means of damping where helical and leaf springs are species of a class well known to perform in an equivalent manner.

5. Applicant's arguments filed 9/22/04 are moot in view of the new grounds of rejection, but are considered persuasive.

6. Claim 16 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claim 16 is allowable because the claimed relatable element in the claimed combination is not disclosed or suggested.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Karl D Easthom whose telephone number is (571) 272-1989. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th, 5:30AM-4:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Elvin Enad can be reached on (571) 272-1990. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2832

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Karl D Easthom  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 2832

KDE